



JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF

-

Review of outstanding sections of the Spanish Report Addendum to STECF 13- 07 (STECF-13-19)

Edited by John Casey & Cristina Castro Ribeiro

This report was reviewed by the STECF by written procedure in October 2013

Report EUR 26225 EN

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy

E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: 0039 0332 789343

Fax: 0039 0332 789658

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>

<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server

<http://europa.eu/>

JRC 85207

EUR 26225 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-33749-9

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/33687

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013

© European Union, 2013

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

How to cite this report:

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF - Review of outstanding sections of the Spanish Report (STECF-13-19). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26225 EN, JRC 85207, 19 pp.

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF- Review of outstanding sections of the Spanish Report (STECF-13-19)	4
Background	4
Request to the STECF	4
STECF comments	4
STECF conclusions	5
Annex I - Annual Report Evaluation Table – Spain	5
List of STECF members	16

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF- Review of outstanding sections of the Spanish Report (STECF-13-19)

THIS REPORT WAS ISSUED BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE IN OCTOBER 2013

Background

STECF-EWG-13-07 took place 1-5 July 2013 in Brussels mainly to conduct the evaluation of MS 2012 Annual Reports for Data Collection to be presented to the STECF July 2013 plenary¹.

During the EWG-13-07 meeting the Annual Reports (AR) 2012 of all MS were reviewed by the EWG, except the Spanish AR 2012 for which the EWG could only carry out a partial review due to the Spanish report not being available in English in time for the meeting. Consequently, an evaluation of the sections of the Spanish AR relating to fleet economics, aquaculture & processing could not be undertaken at that time.

Subsequent to the July plenary meeting of the STECF, the Commission provided an English translation of the 2012 Spanish AR to the STECF and issued an adhoc contract to review the outstanding elements of the AR and prepare a draft report to the STECF. The draft report was reviewed by the STECF in October 2013 and this report represents the outcome of that review. This report was adopted by the STECF by written procedure in October 2013.

Request to the STECF

STECF is requested to evaluate the outstanding sections in order to complete the review of the Spanish AR2012.

STECF comments

This report represents the STECF evaluation of the outstanding sections of the 2012 Annual Report for Data Collection from Spain. The review was prepared in draft through an ad hoc contract, which was reviewed and amended by the STECF by written procedure in October 2013.

STECF notes that some technical terms in the officially-translated text of the Report, mostly related to the fisheries domain, may not have been clearly and accurately translated from Spanish into English. Given that this situation may to some extent have hindered the full comprehension of the text, which may lead to some misunderstanding, STECF requests the Commission to urge Member States to provide their annual reports for data collection in the English language.

STECF notes that the Member States' reports often cite Council regulation 199/2008 as the reference for specific variable definitions and collection methods, e.g.: "Spain calculates the required value of capital in Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008" (AR Spain page 15) or "The Aquaculture Economic

¹ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-07). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26090 EN, JRC 83658, 183 pp.

Survey which collected the main economic data and is the main source of the economic data established in Council Regulation 199/2008”, (AR Spain, page 105).

STECF wishes to point out that the relevant document is Commission Decision 2010/93/EU.

STECF conclusions

Following the current STECF review of the issues that were not addressed in the report of the STECF EWG 13-07 (STECF 13-07), the AR evaluation table for Spain, including the detailed evaluation of the sections on fleet economics, aquaculture and processing industry has been updated and is given in Annex I below.

STECF concludes that the overall summary of compliance with the provisions of the DCF by Spain for 2012 given in the report of the STECF EWG 13-07 (STECF 13-07) remains valid.

Annex I - Annual Report Evaluation Table – Spain

I	Member State:	Spain	Judgement levels		
	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level	
	Version of the AR reviewed	EWG Answer Mostly	No	<10%	
	Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%	
	Overall compliance		Mostly	50-90%	
	Yes		>90%		
			NA	not applicable	
General framework					
II	National data collection organisation		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	A National correspondent and participating institutes				Action needed?
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?			Yes	No
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?			Yes	No
	Are derogations listed?			Yes	No
	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?			Yes	No
	B Regional and International coordination				
	B1 Attendance of international meetings				
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Give information about attendance on planned meetings. Example: WKMSSEL-2, WKAMDEEP should have information on attendance or not.	Mostly	Yes. Give information about attendance on planned meetings.
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Reason for non participation needs to be clarified by meeting.	Mostly	Yes. MS should clarify reason for non attendance
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations				
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?			Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?			Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			Yes	No
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic					
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector				
	A General description of the fishing sector				
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?			Yes	No
	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			Yes	No
	B Economic variables				
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supragions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			Yes	No
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No deviations mentioned	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?			Yes	No
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is respective data quality information given?		Spain explains different reasons in its AR for not providing some CV values in the tables. Additional reasons are stated in table III.B.3. The reasons are not convincing, e.g. in case of data collection strategy B or C, the 70% response rate threshold does not apply, CV has to be presented. The threshold is only applicable for the Census case.	Yes	Yes, MS to provide the missing CV's.
Are the deviations explained?			Yes		
Are the deviations justified?		The explanation:"a variable which does not apply to the strata as a result of which the CV does not apply" (AR Spain, page 17) is not convincing as the reason why a variable does not apply to a specific strata are unclear and remain unexplained. Maybe this is due to the missing English version of the tables, but has to be explained by MS.	Mostly	Yes, MS to clarify or to explain more clearly	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Only the topic is mentioned, not the whole recommendation	Yes	For the future: MS should provide the relevant recommendations in its full and complete form as presented by LM	
Are the responsive actions described ?			Yes		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			Mostly	MS should state in more detail what will be changed and how recommendations are implemented .	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			Yes		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		It remains unclear why MS refers to adaption of a regulation from 2008 saying it still has to be implemented.	No	Yes, MS to clarify.	
SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea					
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector				
	A General description of the fishing sector				
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?			Yes	No
Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			Yes	No	

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified; supra-region should be named "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (negligible)	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels (see Comments)
supra-region should be named "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (negligible)	Yes	
table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

MS did not provide separate section per supra region, so all comments listed under supra region: Baltic Sea et al. are valid, see above		
See above		
See above		

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

See above		
See above		
See above		

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

See above		
See above		
See above		

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

See above		
See above		

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

A General description of the fishing sector

Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?
Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
See above		
See above		

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
See above		
See above		

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

See above		
See above		
See above		

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

See above		
See above		

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

C Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
No real inconsistencies between III.C.3 and III.C.4. However L2 sampling frame seems concerns only North Atlantic region. So coherence between the two tables can be only verify at NAFO-Eastern Arctic scale. If total numbers of trips operated in 2012 are consistent between III.C.3 and III.C.4, total planned numbers of trips to be sampled and achieved numbers are not equal between the two tables.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Oversampling on Sebastes mentella.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Low level of discards for Sebastes mentella.	Mostly	No

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	Yes	No
CVs met for unsorted catches but not for cod discards. No Cvs for Sebastes mentella discards.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Low level of discard sampling.	Mostly	No

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	No	No
	NA	NA

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO and areas ICES V-XII-XIV**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
No real inconsistencies between III.C.3 and III.C.4. However L2 sampling frame seems concerns only North Atlantic region. So coherence between the two tables can be only verify at NAFO-Eastern Arctic scale. If total numbers of trips operated in 2012 are consistent between III.C.3 and III.C.4, total planned numbers of trips to be sampled and achieved numbers are not equal between the two tables.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify.
Gadus morhua, Pandalus borealis, Sebastes spp. sampling intensities are split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are split in different lines.
MS to clarify why for several species the sampling intensities are split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are split in different lines.
Inconsistencies on L3 sampling frame between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4. No sampling achievements on OTB_CRU_40-59_0_0.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify the inconsistencies
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VId), VIII, IX**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
22 stocks were planned to be sampled in NP but 26 documented in AR table III.C.5.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify changes between NP and AR tables.
Inconsistencies in number of sampled metiers between tables III.C.3 and III.C.6	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify
Target planned by metiers partly achieved. Some metiers are not sampled (DRB_MOL, GTR_DEF, ILS_DWS). Most stocks are oversampled.	Partly	Yes. MS to clarify
	Yes	No
	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify if oversampling has resulted in additional costs.

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

	Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	No. For future exercises, MS could review the number of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets.

REGION MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Same metiers for same fishing ground split in different lines. Inconsistencies between some metiers and footnotes provided on characteristics of their sampling frames (M3, M5...).	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	----------------------------------

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Same sampling frames for same fishing ground split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	----------------------------------

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Inconsistency between Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in tables III.C.3 and III.C.4. Target planned by metiers mostly achieved. Metiers undersampled: OTB_DWS and OTB_DEF in several GSAs, PS_SPF GSA07, metiers targeting BFT (LLS and PS_LPF). Metiers oversampled: metiers targeting swordfish and albacore highly oversampled. Most stocks are oversampled. No discard sampling.	Partly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	----------------------------------

Are the deviations explained?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Were CV targets met?

	Partly	No
--	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	NA	NA
--	----	----

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are the responsive actions described ?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

As oversampling is not yet enough to achieve target precision for most of the stocks.	Partly	Yes. MS to review the numbers of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC+WCPFC

C Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Region information split by RFMO.	Mostly	No
-----------------------------------	--------	----

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
-----------------------------------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Table filled but not consistent with NP table. 37 species/stocks were listed in NP but 50 found in AR tables.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Inconsistencies in fishing ground codes between table III.C.6 and other tables. Some inconsistencies with table III.C.5 : for example how to explain for CECAF that 270 octopus were sampled for landings in III.C.5 and 360 for landings in III.C.6 .	Mostly	No
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	----

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Good achievement rates reached in terms of trips sampled for OTB in CECAF, but other metiers appears heavily undersampled. For tunas fisheries good chievement rates in ICCAT region except for LHP_LPF in Cantabrian Sea and Canarias, good only for longliners in IOTC region (failure for PS_LPF, especially at sea), good in IATTC+WCPFC regions. Concerning stocks, good achievement rates are obtained for well sampled metiers. Cephalopods, shrimp and anchovy are undersampled in CECAF, commercial LPF were correctly sampled in ICCAT, only albacore was sampled as planned and other tunas or swordfish heavily undersampled in IOTC, swordfish is OK in Pacific ocean.	Partly	No
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Were CV targets met?

	Mostly	No
--	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

	Yes	No
--	-----	----

	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	No
		No fully acceptable action is proposed. Shortfalls due to "force majeure" cases in CECAF (fishing rights, exclusion of MS vessels, etc.) MS cannot planned such difficulties. For tropical LPF fisheries, MS considered that difficulties met are usual when implenting monitoring programme in these regions.	

Region North Atlantic

D	Recreational fisheries					
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No recreational fishery is declare in Baltic Sea and North Sea Regions	Yes	No		
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA	No		
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No		
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No		
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
	Were data quality targets provided?		Yes	No		
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No		
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No		
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No		
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No		
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls					
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No		

Region Mediterranean and Black Sea

D	Recreational fisheries			
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?			
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA	
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were data quality targets provided?		Yes	No
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Mostly	No
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No

E	Biological stock-related variables		
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	No

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

E	Biological stock-related variables			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly complete following the NP proposal. MS add a column for relevant comments.	Yes	No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Numbers of fish to be sampled are achieved except for cod sex-ratio@length. Oversampling for 6 parameters.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Data collection is done by observers on board industrial vessels, from the beginning to the end of long trips. So oversampling has no extra costs. Deviations for co sex-ratio explained by a wrong implementation of protocols during one trip.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Yes when samples sizes and compositions permitted to calculate CVs.	Mostly	No
Target precision achieved for weight@length and for cod ALK.	Mostly	No
Variability in samples, too many immature fish in som samples, redfish otoliths not yet read.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
2 recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2011 and 8th LM on task sharing are listed by MS.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips. Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocols on board.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Table properly complete. MS add a column for relevant comments. According to III.E.2 13 stocks were planned to be updated in 2012. 15 found in III.E.3 AR table.	Yes	No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
Data collection targets in numbers of fish were planned only when carried out by observers on board. Achievement rates are mostly reached. Stocks are either oversampled or lightly undersampled. In other cases updating of biological paramaters was performed during scientific surveys, without planned targets.	Mostly	No
Data collection is done by observers on board industrial vessels, from the beginning to the end of long trips. So oversampling has no extra costs. Deviations for biological sampling are also explain when vessel skipper decides changes in fishing areas or target species.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Yes for the two types of data collection, surveys as observers.	Yes	No
Mostly. Achievement rates are in general obtained for weight@length and maturity@length, but never for sex ratio@length.	Mostly	No
Variability with fish sizes in samples, difficulties for planning efficient sampling plans for these industrial fisheries.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
2 recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2011 and 8th LM on task sharing are listed by MS.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips. Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocols on board. But for surveys, it is impossible to change the protocols only to collect more biological samples.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VIId), VIII, IX

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Table properly complete. MS add a column for relevant comments. According to III.E.2 13 stocks were planned to be updated in 2012. 15 found in III.E.3 AR table.	Yes	No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
Most of time, stocks were oversampled. But heavy undersampling for Nephrops and Pagellus bogaravero in IXa.	Yes	No

	Are the deviations explained?	All deviations are explained in AR, stock by stock and for every parameter. Main reasons are the following: imperfect coverage of all the length sizes in samples available; sampling plans are built in numbers of samples and not in numbers of individuals; when oversampling, there is no additional costs, mostly when samples are collected at sea; for some stocks, low landings and too high prices could cause in final undersampling; shorter fishing seasons than expected also.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Were CV estimates provided?	For most of parameters updated, when samples sizes permittued to calculate CVs.	Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?	Precision target achieved for less than 50% parameters. Best achievement rates for weight@length and maturity@length, bad for sex-ratios@length.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	2 derogations listed in section 1 for stocks variables of whiting and for maturity of blue whiting.	Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	3 relevant recommendations of RCM NA 2011 and 8th LM listed.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS remains focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment working groups. Further steps will be : better age reading for difficult species, improve processing and reading of pieces collected, review maturity scales etc.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
REGION MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA				
E Biological stock-related variables				
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled and consistent with III.E.2. 15 stocks were to be updated. Parameters are provided for 20 stocks in AR III.E.3 table (initially not planned stocks are well identified in the table). Task sharing on LPF is lso correctly documented. An extra column added for comments.	Yes	No. For the future, only for the Med&BS Region, MS should report data (both in the NP and in the AR) at GSA level (not all GSA togheter), as GFCM and RCM promote this issue. MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes for practically all parameters.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	MS provided details on lightly oversampling of sardine, anchovy, monkfish and Nephrops, and lightly undersampling of red mullet.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for stocks sampled on yearly basis.	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Yes for most of parameters.	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Explanations is given for deviations concerning length@age for 4 species : too big sizes range by age class.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One relevant recommendations of RCM Med&BS 2011 and 8th LM listed.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	To increase numbers of samples for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note achieved.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs CEEAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC+WCPFC				
E Biological stock-related variables				
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table fulfilled. 10 stocks planned to be updated in CEEAF, only BFT, albacore and swordfish in LDF LPF fisheries. An extra column added for comments.	Yes	No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Good achievement rates for SPF and squid. Other Cephalopods appear as undersampled, hake as not sampled t all, and pink shrimp as partially sampled. Achievement is good in tunas fisheries, except for maturity@length of swordfish.	Mostly	No

	Are the deviations explained?	Deviations are explained stock by stock. Operational difficulties for sampling on board, changes in fishermen behaviour, no renewing of fishing agreements between EU and third countries are the more important reasons given for CECAF. Difficulties for buiding efficient sampling plans for LDF fisheries. For swordfish maturity, few females were fished and not during the spawning season.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided?	According to DCF regulation, CVs of concerned stocks shall be provided on triennial basis, ie in the 2013 AR.	NA	NA
	Were CV targets met?		NA	NA
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	6 derogation listed concerning tunas fisheries, and more precisely exemptions for sex ratio and maturity in ICCAT and IOTC and all stock related variables in IATTC+WCPFC	Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	1 relevant recommendation of RCM LDF 2011 and 8th LM listed concerning CECAF.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Difficulties met are usual for LDF fisheries and do not come often under scientific issues.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
F	Transversal variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table III.F.1 is not consistent with the guidelines, wrong template used. Table III.F.1 incomplete. Information for North Atlantic with missing variables for effort; information for Mediterranean&Black Sea incomplete and complete absence of transversal data for Other Fishing Regions (OFR). Detail on missing variables below.	Yes	No
F1	Capacity			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The design and achievements are consistent however the information is incomplete. There's no information for capacity variables in Other Fishing Regions (OFR).	Partly	MS to complete the table.
	Are the deviations explained?		No	Yes, see main comment.
	Are the deviations justified?		No	Yes, see main comment.
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F2	Effort			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Partly.	MS to complete the table.
	Are the deviations explained?		No	
	Are the deviations justified?		No	
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species for which it's not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions.	Mostly	MS to clarify if price and value per specie is being estimated from sales notes or from questionnaire on economic variables. Tabel III.F.1 must be updated with the landing variables collected/estimated for Other Fishing Regions.
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	MS to clarify why the use of sales notes for vessels landing abroad (Reg.(CE) 1224/2009) is not used as a data source.
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			

	Is respective data quality information given?		Mostly	MS to provide missing information on quality for the price and values per species.
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G	Research surveys at sea			
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?		Yes	No
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Species named, but not clear to which cell it is related.	Yes	MS should put the respective letter behind the cell of Species names (reported in the foot notes of Table IVa1) as specifically requested by the Guidelines
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	A census was carried out but the planned sample rate was only 75%	Mostly	MS should explain why the achieved sample rate is below 100%
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Miscalculations of response rate in line 15	Mostly	MS has to provide correct sample rate
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	For the future MS may makes use of the comment concerning CV application
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Was not applicable, but MS refers to Fao and Eurostat, in this case the text should be more specified.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	Yes, please be more specific, in particular what do these application mean in detail.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS may be reminded, that in particular LM recommendations are of relevance here	Yes	No

		Mostly	Yes, if MS refers to international standards it should clearly state in what sense is is relevant and where it has been applied, as it is assumend thta each MS applies relevant international standards and rules. If mentioned here, it should be specified what and how has been applied.
Are the responsive actions described ?			
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

V **Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are the relevant derogations listed?

	Yes	No
	NA	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	NA	
	NA	

VI **Module for management and use of the data**

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?

Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

See general comment on data transmission	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
In section II.A	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	NA	
	NA	

VII **Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Most of the recommendations listed are not applicable to MS. Next year, only recommendations applicable to MS to be listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

VIII **List of acronyms and abbreviations**

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

--	--	--

IX **IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

--	--	--

X **X. References**

Is there a complete list of references?

--	--	--

XI **XI. Annexes**

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

--	--	--

List of STECF members

¹ - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of MemberStates or stakeholders. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Abella, J. Alvaro(vice-chair)	ARPAT – AREA MARE Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione Ambientale della Toscana Articolazione Funzionale RIBM Risorse Ittiche e Biodiversità Marina Via Marradi 114, 57126 Livorno – Italia	Tel. 0039-055-3206956	alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it
Andersen, JesperLevring (vice-chair)	Department of Food and Resource Economics (IFRO) Section for Environment and Natural Resources University of Copenhagen Rolighedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg Denmark	Tel.dir.: +45 35 28 68 92	jla@ifro.ku.dk
Bailey, Nicholas	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory, P.O Box 101 375 Victoria Road, Torry Aberdeen AB11 9DB UK	Tel: +44 (0)1224 876544 Direct: +44 (0)1224 295398 Fax: +44 (0)1224 295511	baileyn@marlab.ac.uk n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk
Bertignac, Michel	Laboratoire de Biologie Halieutique IFREMER Centre de Brest BP 70 - 29280 Plouzane, France	tel : +33 (0)2 98 22 45 25 - fax : +33 (0)2 98 22 46 53	michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr
Cardinale,Massimi liano	Föreningsgatan 45, 330 Lysekil, Sweden	Tel: +46 523 18750	massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se
Casey, John (chair)	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel: +44 1502 52 42 51 Fax: +44 1502 52 45 11	john.casey@cefas.co.uk

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Curtis, Hazel	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS	Tel: +44 (0)131 558 3331 Fax: +44 (0)131 558 1442	H.Curtis@seafish.co.uk
Delaney, Alyne	Innovative Fisheries Management, -an Aalborg University Research Centre, Postboks 104, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark	Tel.: +45 9940 3694	ad@ifm.aau.dk
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Tel.: +359 52 646892	gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk
Döring, Ralf	Thünen Bundesforschungsinstitut, für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Institut für Seefischerei - AG Fischereiökonomie, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel.: 040 38905-185 Fax.: 040 38905-263	ralf.doering@ti.bund.de
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST 65 Route de Saint Briec, bat.4 CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex France	Tel:+33(0)2.23.48.55.3 4 Fax: +33(0)2.23.48.55.35	Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr
Graham, Norman	Marine Institute, Fisheries Science Services (FSS), Rinville, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel: + 353(0) 91 87200	norman.graham@marine.ie
Garcia Rodriguez, Mariano	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Servicios Centrales, Corazón de María 8, 28002, Madrid, Spain		Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es
Gustavsson, Tore Karl-Erik	Fiskeriverket, National Board of Fisheries, Ekonomi och personalenheten, Box 423, 401 26, Göteborg, Sverige	Tel 00-46-31-74-30- 300 Fax 00-46-31-74-30- 444	tore.gustavsson@fiskeriverket.se
Jennings, Simon	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	simon.jennings@cefass.co.uk
Kenny, Andrew	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	andrew.kenny@cefass.co.uk
Kirkegaard, Eskild	DTU Aqua, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Charlottenlund Slot, JægersborgAllé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark	Tel: +45 33 96 33 42 Fax: + 45 33 96 33 49	ek@aquadtu.dk
Kraak, Sarah	University College Cork Based at: Marine Institute, Rinville, Oranmore, Co Galway, Ireland	Tel: +353 (0)91 387392 Fax +353 (0)91 387201	Sarah.kraak@marine.ie

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Kuikka, Sakari	University of Helsinki, Department of Environmental Sciences, P.O. Box 65 (Viikinkaari 1), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND	Tel.: +358 50 3309233 Fax: +358-9-191 58754	skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar Passeig Marítim, 37-49 08003 Barcelona Spain	Tel: 34.93.2309500 direct line : 34.93.2309552 Fax: 34.93.2309555	paloma@icm.csic.es
Malvarosa, Loretta	Irepa onlus via San Leonardo, trav. Migliaro Salerno - Italia	Tel: 0039 089 338978 Fax: 0039 089 330835	malvarosa@irepa.org
Murua, Hilario	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel: 0034 667174433 Fax: 94 6572555	hmurua@azti.es
Nord, Jenny	The Swedish Agency of Marine and Water Management (SwAM)	Tel. 0046 76 140 140 3	Jenny.nord@havochvatten.se
Nowakowski, Piotr	West Pomeranian University of Technology – Faculty of Food Science and Fisheries, Department of Fishing Technique, Szczecin		piotr.nowakowski@zut.edu.pl
Prelezzo, Raul	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	Tel: 94 6029400 Ext: 406- Fax: 94 6870006	rprelezzo@suk.azti.es
Sala, Antonello	Fishing Technology Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078841 Fax: +39 071 55313	a.sala@ismar.cnr.it
Scarcella, Giuseppe	Environmental Management Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078846 Fax: +39 071 55313	g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it
Somarakis, Stylianios	Department of Biology University of Crete Vassilika Vouton P.O. Box 2208 71409 Heraklion Crete Greece	Tel.: +30 2610 394065, +30 6936566764	somarak@biology.uoc.gr
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de
Theret, Francois	Scapêche 17 Bd Abbé Le Cam 56100 Lorient France		ftheret@comata.com

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Ulrich, Clara	DTU Aqua, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Charlottenlund Slot, Jægersborg Allé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark		cu@aqua.dtu.dk
Vanhee, Willy	ILVO - Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Unit Animal Sciences - Fisheries Ankerstraat 1, B-8400 Oostende, Belgium	Tel 00-32-59-34-22-55 Fax 00-32-59-33-06-29	willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
van Oostenbrugge, Hans	Landbouweconomisch Instituut-LEI, Fisheries Section, Burg. Patijnlaan 19 P.O.Box 29703 2502 LS The Hague The Netherlands	Tel: +31 (0)70 3358239 Fax: +31 (0)70 3615624	Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl

European Commission

EUR 26225 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries.– Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF - Review of outstanding sections of the Spanish Report (STECF-13-19).

STECF members: Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2013 – 19 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-33749-9

doi:10.2788/33687

Abstract

STECF reviewed outstanding sections in order to complete the review of the Spanish AR2012 by written procedure in September/October 2013.

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle. Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.